

## **REMARKS**

The drawings have been amended to show the plurality of laminations in the stationary piece and moving piece, without adding new matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to Fig. 3, because item "24" is an opening in the bobbin 23. The number "22" refers to a pole face or gap between the stationary and moving members. Applicants believe that Fig. 3 is correct, and request clarification if this objection is not withdrawn. Accordingly, withdrawal of both objections is requested.

Independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to overcome the outstanding § 112 rejection of independent claim 1, without narrowing the scope of the claims. Withdrawal is requested.

The claims stand rejected on the basis of various combinations of references, all of which include Pfenning '297. Applicants respectfully traverse all of the rejections on the basis that Pfenning is not analogous art, as discussed at the June 25, 2003 personal interview with Patrick G. Burns.

Pfenning is not analogous art because it describes a relay, not a vibrator motor. As seen in Section 2141.01(a) of the M.P.E.P., a reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor, or if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problems with which the inventor was concerned. The Pfenning reference does not satisfy either criteria in this case.

A relay is not in the field of a vibrator motor. A relay is not a motor because a relay does not drive a workload. It merely makes and breaks electrical contacts. In addition,

a relay does not operate continuously like a motor, and it only operates in response to command signals. In contrast, a motor operates continuously whenever power is applied. Moreover, vibrator motors are classified in U.S. 310 and relays are classified in U.S. 335. For these reasons, Pfenning is not in the field of endeavor of the present invention.

The present invention eliminated the tail spring used in conventional vibrator motors, such as the tail spring 118 in U.S. Patent No. 5,787,587. Pfenning does not address or attempt to solve the problem of eliminating the tail spring in a vibrator motor. Moreover, Pfenning uses a permanent magnet to bias its relay instead of a spring, a solution that teaches away from the present invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of Pfenning is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

September 5, 2003  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315  
F:\Data\WP60\2206\64630\Amend B.doc